

INTERGENERATIONAL MALE HOMOSEXUAL
COUPLES: AN EXAMINATION OF SEX
ROLE ASCRIPTION, ATTITUDES
TOWARD MEN'S AND WOMEN'S
ROLES AND SEX ROLE
BEHAVIORS

By

ROBERTO DESDIN

"

Bachelor of Arts
Drew University
Madison, New Jersey
1974

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1977

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1983



INTERGENERATIONAL MALE HOMOSEXUAL
COUPLES: AN EXAMINATION OF SEX
ROLE ASCRIPTION, ATTITUDES
TOWARD MEN'S AND WOMEN'S
ROLES AND SEX ROLE
BEHAVIORS

Thesis Approved:

Vicki Green

Thesis Adviser

Herrett P. Sandholz

James L. Phillips

Kenneth F. Kries

Norman N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Vicki Green, my major adviser, for her guidance, time and continued encouragement in this research way beyond the call of duty. I am indeed fortunate to have met such a friend. Appreciation is expressed to the committee members for their feedback and time. I owe a special debt to El Centro Community Mental Health Center for offering me a Ph.D. level position without my Ph.D. I pay that debt back now with many thanks.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my parents for their unwavering belief, support and encouragement throughout my educational career. They have waited many years for this moment with great anticipation. This dissertation is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
Problems With Past Research	5
Homosexuals in Relationships.	8
Sex Roles and Adjustment.	14
Theoretical Framework for Gay Couples	18
III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	23
IV. METHOD	26
Subjects.	26
Measures.	27
Procedure	33
V. RESULTS.	34
VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	39
REFERENCES.	45
APPENDIX A - TABLES	52
APPENDIX B - INSTRUCTIONS	57
APPENDIX C - INSTRUMENTS.	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Means and Standard Deviations: All Variables	53
II.	Correlation Matrix: Dependent Variables. . . .	54
III.	Analysis of Variance: Demographic Variables	55
IV.	Analysis of Variance: Attitudes Towards Women Scale	56
V.	Analysis of Covariance: ATMTS Total Score . . .	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research focused upon homosexuality has historically reflected changes in attitudes and social thought. During the 18th and 19th centuries, homosexuality was a topic of interest only for medical and psychiatric personnel. Homosexuality was viewed as an oddity, a deviation from the norm that had "medical" or psychiatric implications. This was changed somewhat by the information collected by Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948). Their findings, that approximately ten percent of the male population was homosexually inclined, suggested that homosexuality was more widespread than most people thought. Unfortunately, such statistics did not alter the prevailing view of homosexuals. The medical and psychoanalytic professions continued to view such individuals as ill.

In 1969, the National Institute of Mental Health Task Force on Homosexuality was established. The creation of such a body gave public acknowledgement to the concept of homosexuality as a lifestyle; in addition, scientific studies were both encouraged and funded. One such study is that of Weinberg and Williams (1974) in which problems and adaptations within a homosexual lifestyle were examined.

Such studies as Weinberg et al. (1974) are rare; the more common study (e.g., Bieber, 1962; Socarides, 1972) continues to focus upon etiology and treatment. The American Psychiatric Association's declassification of homosexuality as a sexual deviation encouraged physicians and psychiatrists to view homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle, not as an illness. However, society is far from accepting this view. Only a few contemporary books (Altman, 1973; Weinberg, 1973) deal with homosexuality as a rightful choice and not as a disease stemming from pathological relationships.

Not only has society viewed the homosexual as ill, but it has also had a preconceived notion of the homosexual relationship as one characterized by high promiscuity and little emotional investment. In actuality, every kind of relationship exists within homosexuality, from frequent promiscuous contacts to brief encounters to ongoing relationships which closely parallel heterosexual unions (Tripp, 1975; Bell & Weinberg, 1978). Most people have not been fully aware of this wide range of relationships and have focused on the promiscuous examples (Humphreys, 1970). Until recently, the more stable forms of relationships have been ignored. There is only one study which deals exclusively with a multifaceted psychological analysis of a male homosexual couple's relationship (Desdin, 1977), and there are only three other studies (Westmoreland, 1975; Chaffee, 1976; Stevens, 1975) which deal with different

aspects of such a relationship. Due to the limited number of studies, it is impossible to get a comprehensive and definite understanding of male homosexual couples.

One of the major focuses of the Desdin (1977) study was upon role relationships. Male homosexual couples were found to practice more egalitarian role relationships than heterosexual couples. An additional finding was that attitudes toward women's and men's nontraditional roles were related to age in the homosexual group, with older subjects holding more conservative attitudes. The extent to which these attitudes were reflected in actual role behaviors was not clear. It is important to describe more thoroughly the relationship of different age homosexual intimates, as well as examine the relationship of role attitudes and role behavior for such couples.

One of the major focuses of the Desdin (1977) study was upon role relationships. Male homosexual couples were found to practice more egalitarian role relationships than heterosexual couples. An additional finding was that attitudes toward women's and men's nontraditional roles were related to age in the homosexual group, with older subjects holding more conservative attitudes. The extent to which these attitudes were reflected in actual role behaviors was not clear. It is important to describe more thoroughly the relationship of different age homosexual intimates, as well as examine the relationship of role attitudes and role behavior for such couples.

The present study compared the intimate relationships of homosexual dyads of different ages. At a time when traditional roles within marriage are being questioned, along with the healthiness or pathology of these traditional unions (Broverman, Broverman, & Clarkson, 1970; Kando, 1972), homosexual couples provide a unique source for valuable information (Sweet, 1975). Such a study would not only provide information about the behavior of a nontraditional couple, but would provide much needed information about homosexual relationships at different life stages. A better understanding of the homosexual requires that we look at him not only as an individual, but also as part of a system which includes interactions with significant others. Knowledge of how these interactions differ for younger versus older stable male gay couples would provide further information which might be the basis for further positive societal change.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Problems With Past Research

A review of the literature on male homosexuality* reveals two major problems with research generated in this area. One of these is the almost exclusive focus upon examining the etiology of homosexuality. Simon and Gagnon (1969) feel this is the most difficult and least rewarding of all approaches. Cooper (1974) calls the etiological literature misguided and irrelevant. Hooker (1969) argues that a psychodynamic interpretation is not sufficient for an understanding of homosexuality and that what is needed is a narrower focus on aspects of homosexuality. The second such problem is that homosexuals have always been viewed as a homogeneous group, and their behavior examined accordingly. This overly simplistic view has resulted in covering up the diversity among homosexuals and concentrating on the sexual aspect of their life (Humphreys, 1970). This concern with one aspect of a person's life has not occurred in research

*The review except where specifically stated will refer to research on male homosexuality. Thus, the male personal pronoun will be used throughout except with reference to work with females.

with heterosexuals, but the mere assumption of "sexual deviation" seems to give the sexual content more significance. Stinger and Gryger (1976) have argued that a highly differentiated multidimensional approach be taken in the study of homosexual personalities.

The present review will not attempt to discuss the etiological literature, or that which considers the homosexual as homogeneous. It will focus on studies examining the adjustment of male homosexuals as such relates to the establishment of an intimate homosexual relationship and the important variables therein.

Homosexuality and Adjustment

Studies on adjustment are relevant to understanding the establishment of significant interpersonal relationships, for most of the psychiatric disorders are defined in terms of inappropriate or unsatisfactory interaction styles. If the homosexual is maladjusted, then it is unlikely that his relationships will be satisfactory, or of any significant duration.

One manner in which maladjustment has been evaluated, is on the basis of projective tests results. In a classic study by Hooker (1957), an expert panel was not able to distinguish between a matched group of male homosexuals and heterosexuals on the basis of the Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test, and Make A Picture Story. This finding has profound impact given the fact that these projective

tests have traditionally been used in the identification of homosexuals or latent homosexuals. This finding suggests that homosexuality represents a sex-object preference rather than an aberration of personality, a conclusion substantiated in other studies. Evans (1970), using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, concluded that at most, homosexuals could be considered mildly neurotic and did not necessarily have psychological disturbances. The clearest differences were in terms of sexual orientation. Thompson, McCandless, and Strickland (1971) reported no differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals in defensiveness, personal adjustment, or self-confidence. In 1965, Schofield found a greater commonality between patients being seen for therapy, regardless of whether they were homosexual or heterosexual, than between each clinical group and its respective nonclinical group. The common variable here was patient status, and not sexual orientation. In his review of the literature on adjustment in male homosexuality, Siegelman (1972) criticized both the medical view of homosexuality and the use of clinical patients in studies on homosexuality. In his study on the adjustment level of non-clinical samples of homosexuals and heterosexuals, he found that the homosexuals appeared more well adjusted on some scales, less well adjusted on others, and did not differ from the control group on about half of the scales. Of greater interest was the result of much better adjustment in masculine homosexuals than in a comparable group of

masculine heterosexuals. Again, homosexuality per se was not indicative of pathology. Ohlson (1973), after administering the Jourard and Lasakow Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, found no difference between a homosexual group and a heterosexual group on the ability to disclose, self-concept, and neuroticism. He concluded that male homosexuals have the same ability as heterosexuals to establish bonds of trust, love, and affection. Desdin (1977) found homosexuals to be no different than heterosexuals on the nine scales of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Scale.

These studies indicate that the homosexual cannot be differentiated from the heterosexual on the basis of his adjustment. In addition, since homosexuals do not appear to be maladjusted as a group, there is little logic in studying clinic populations of gays and generalizing to all gays.

Homosexuals in Relationships

While the homosexual has been greatly studied as an individual in terms of his adjustment in comparison to the heterosexual, his relationships with other homosexuals has until recently been ignored. This may be partially due to the popular belief that there are few if any examples of stable long term homosexual relationships. Kinsey et al. (1948) stated that relationships between two males rarely survived the first disagreements. Studies which have been completed on male homosexual relationships have been basically of an ethnographic nature, with personal observation

being the technique employed. Studies using statistical analyses have been very limited.

Reviews of the ethnographic studies (Hooker, 1969; Nuehring et al., 1974; Altman, 1971) state that the homosexual is in search of permanent relationships, but that the gay bar system with its high promiscuity works against it, as does society at large because of the prohibitions involved. Nevertheless, many relationships do survive. Hooker (1969) comments that these unions involved complex problems of domestic arrangements and role managements, but she makes no attempt to describe the variety or complexity of such relationships. Utilizing a questionnaire format, Weinberg and Williams (1974) found that 34% of male homosexuals were limiting their sexual relationships primarily to one person, with 23% reporting having sustained the relationship for more than a year. In addition, 69% reported having an exclusive relationship in the past, with 37% answering that it had lasted more than a year. In an ethnographic study, Warren (1974) describes three models of long term sexual relationships or marriages within the homosexual community. One type is akin to the faithful heterosexual couple, another is similar to the open arrangement type marriage, and the third is known as the three-way arrangement, in which the couple seeks sex with a third person together. Warren views the homosexual monogamous marriage as impractical and, at best, a first step toward the other two types of long term relationships.

Warren states that there are differences in how partners for different types of relationships are chosen; while short term partners are based solely on sexual preference, long term partners are generally chosen on the basis of ethnic, racial, age, and class similarity. Bell and Weinberg (1978) in a more recent study found the following typology to be useful in the study of homosexual relationships: close-coupled, open-coupled. These two types are similar to those described by Warren (1974). A problem with the Bell and Weinberg study is that the data was collected in 1969, and may not be representative of today's homosexual culture. In summary, homosexuals are likely involved in various types of intimacies including short and long term relationships.

The adjustment characteristics of the individuals involved in these relationships have been studied. Hammersmith and Weinberg (1973) found support of significant others positively related to psychological adjustment and homosexual commitment. Weinberg and Williams (1974) found the homosexual dyad to be composed of individuals who are better adjusted than single homosexuals. In addition, the homosexual who has had more experience with exclusive relationships reports more self-acceptance, a greater stability of self-concept, less depression, less interpersonal awkwardness, and less loneliness than did the homosexual with less experience. Dickey (1961) found that homosexual married males felt themselves to be more adequate than unmarried homosexual males. Desdin (1977) found stable

gay male couples to be as well adjusted as stable unmarried heterosexual couples. Bell and Weinberg (1978) found that homosexual males in a closed relationship could not be differentiated from heterosexuals on various measures of psychological adjustment and, in fact, scored higher on two happiness measures. In summary, not only are homosexual individuals as well adjusted as heterosexuals, but homosexual couples appear to be better adjusted than unattached homosexuals and are also as well adjusted as their heterosexual counterparts.

In addition to adjustment, the role relations of homosexuals have also been studied. Historically, these were viewed as follows: psychoanalytic theory provided a description of the homosexual as a person with crossed sexual identification. Utilizing this framework, Terman and Miles (1936) divided homosexuals into active and passive groups and then administered a masculinity-femininity test. The femininity scores of the passive homosexuals were found to correlate positively with those of the female heterosexuals. The implication of this research was that such role reversals distorted intimate relationships.

A more contemporary view (Weinberg & Williams, 1974) is that problems in a homosexual relationship do not occur from role reversal. Rather, problems occur as a result of society's denial that such a relationship exists; thus, rules are not provided for successful role interactions. A male homosexual may at first find himself at a loss for

guidelines on interacting with another male; problems may arise such as who should lead while dancing, cruising, engaging in sex, and running a household. Additionally, the negative attitude held by society may have lessened the homosexual's respect for the social mores. Thus, some couples may feel free to make up their own rules. Alternatively, traditional sex roles may be employed by some homosexual couples in order to facilitate their interactions. More contemporary ethnographic studies shed some light on this area. Hooker (1969) comments that contrary to popular belief, in homosexual relationships sex roles are not rigidly dichotomized into masculine and feminine roles. There are some pairs who follow traditional heterosexual patterns, but these are in the minority. Generally, the variety and form of the sexual acts between partners, and the distribution and character of the tasks performed do not lend themselves to such a differentiation. Sonenschein (1968) states that traditional kinds of gender and role distinctions are typical only of a small minority of homosexual relationships. Altman (1971) comments that sometimes homosexual marriages are close imitations of a traditional marriage in terms of roles, but more likely they exhibit less well defined roles. Nuehring et al. (1974) report that homosexual marriages are close parallels to the patterns of heterosexual couples, but differ in the area of sex roles, where they are less sex typed. Freedman (1975) also cites more egalitarian sex roles as being characteristic of gay

couples. While sex roles may be egalitarian, Dickey (1961) found greater reported adjustment for homosexuals with masculine sex roles than with feminine sex roles. Coupled with the finding of greater feelings of adequacy in couples (Dickey, 1961), one hypothesis might be that both partners are exhibiting masculine sex roles. This is contrary to beliefs as held by the general public. In a recent study, Tavris (1977) also found that homosexual respondents regarded themselves as less masculine than average, and more feminine than average. Ward (1975) found cross sex typing to be significantly more prevalent among homosexuals (31% for males, 38% for females) than heterosexuals. Recent studies also support a view of equality in sex roles, with Stevens (1975) and Westmoreland (1975) reporting either equal or interchangeable sex roles in over half of their sample of gay couples. Bell and Weinberg (1978) report that in the male homosexual couples they studied there was little evidence of a "masculine/feminine" sex role dichotomy in the sharing or performance of household tasks. More recent ethnographic studies share this viewpoint (Mendola, 1980; Silverstein, 1981). Notably, in all three of these studies the technique of data collection was based on personal interviews with unstandardized questionnaires. Desdin (1977) reported equality in the sex roles of the gay couples he studied, with the sex role identification tending toward the masculine direction. This study used standardized questionnaires to assess sex role attitudes and behaviors. A

problem with the Desdin (1977) study, however, is that all couples studied were under 35 years of age. It is possible that results were biased, as age differences were not considered and older couples were not used as subjects. This is a possible bias in other studies focusing upon gay couples (Stevens, 1975; Chaffee, 1976; Westmoreland, 1975). An alternative explanation adhered to by Hooker is that such results may not be attributable to age biases in samples but rather honestly reflect the possibility that the pattern of role relationships in the homosexual world is changing over time. In referring to the homosexual couple's egalitarian sex roles, Hooker (1969) attributes such to the changing culture of the homosexual world.

Sex Roles and Adjustment

As the homosexual world is changing, there is some evidence that the heterosexual world is at least experiencing some strain. With the advent of the women's movement and increasing concern about the place of women in the society, studies have begun to focus more closely on the appropriateness of traditional sex roles and the questionable adjustment of individuals who are clearly sex role stereotyped. Kando (1972) in a study looking at how individuals meet the demands of a self-acknowledged sex role, found that males experience little anxiety in this area, and that females experience much anxiety. Broverman et al. (1972) found that men and women had clearly defined sex role

stereotypes. Bem (1975) in reviewing the effects of traditional sex typing, concluded that high femininity in females was consistently correlated with low self-esteem, low self-acceptance. She adds that greater intellectual development has consistently been associated with cross sex typing. Mednick and Weissman (1975), in reviewing the implications of role change for men, conclude that little empirical work has appeared in this area. Hochschild (1973) in a similar review, states that little research has been done on the sex roles of men, and even less on men qua men. Tavris (1977) concludes that the concept of masculinity is undergoing some change away from the "macho" image, but it is slow. In summary, the scientific literature has produced little data on heterosexual as well as homosexual male sex roles.

This apparent lack of knowledge concerning male sex roles may not be due solely to ignorance. One alternative reason might be the lack of a theoretical framework in which to understand behaviors which may not be wholly masculine or feminine. Another reason may be the inappropriateness of the evaluative measures previously used. In reviewing the concepts of masculinity and femininity, Jenkin and Vroegh (1969) suggested that new scales be developed where these two concepts are not mutually exclusive. Constantinople (1973) and Bem (1974) questioned the validity of masculinity-femininity as a bipolar dimension. In summary, there appears to be a need for a new theoretical framework, as well as new measurements, to further research in this area.

The concept of androgyny, or the combination of both male and female characteristics within a person, may be the new theoretical term which Hooker (1969) seems to be searching for in describing homosexual relationships. Block (1973), in adding to Loevinger's (1966) developmental framework, integrates the concept of sex role identity with the tasks of ego and cognitive development. Block's (1973) approach is nontraditional in that she does not assume that the ultimate development of sex role is either masculinity or femininity. Rather sexual identity means the development of a sense of self which is secure enough with gender that the individual can and does express human qualities which until now society has labeled as atypical for the individual's gender. Block (1973) believes this integration is essential for development and self-actualization. In reviewing the literature, she feels that women suffer the most from role constraints, although she acknowledges the benefits of androgyny for both sexes, as do Osofsky and Osofsky (1972).

A measurement of androgyny was first postulated by Sandra Bem. Bem (1974) developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) as a measure of androgyny in which the dimensions of masculinity and femininity are empirically as well as logically independent.* The assumption underlying the BSRI

*During the period in which the original thesis (Desdin, 1977) was conceived, use of the BSRI was prevalent. Since that time, much controversy has been generated about use of the BSRI especially in comparison to use of the

is that role behavior cannot be dichotomized into masculine and feminine. In addition, Bem assumes that individuals do not exhibit consistent traits across situations, but rather express behaviors that are situation specific. Thus, an individual, who can express behaviors according to the situational pull and not according to trait specific sex role stereotypes, is labeled as androgynous and is thought to be better adjusted than a rigidly stereotyped individual. This would appear to make sense from a psychopathological viewpoint, for rigidity in cognition and behavior is one characteristic of the neuroses.

The BSRI has been used in contemporary research to assess the relationship between sex roles and other behaviors, such as adjustment, attitudes toward feminism, and self-esteem. Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) examined the relationship between BSRI scores and adjustment in college undergraduates. Androgyny was found to be related to adjustment in females, but not for the males; for males, masculinity was associated with better adjustment than androgyny. Zeldow (1976), in the only study found looking at psychological androgyny and attitudes toward feminism, as measured by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) found that feminine men had more conservative attitudes than feminine women. Neither

*(Continued) PAQ-Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) (for a discussion of the differences between the two scales, see Orlofsky, 1982).

androgynous and masculine men nor their female counterparts differed significantly in their attitudes. In addition, Zeldow (1976) stated that masculinity might be healthy for both sexes, a statement supported by others (Broverman et al., 1970; Tavris, 1977; Dickey, 1961; Block, 1973;). Using an alternate measure of androgyny, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974), Spence et al. (1975) reported androgyny to be positively correlated with self esteem. Desdin (1977) used the BSRI in an assessment of sex role identification in gay couples. Findings indicated both gay couples and heterosexual cohabitating couples are characterized by androgynous sex role ascription. However, when a behavioral measure was used, it was found that the heterosexual couples were traditionally sex role stereotyped in their household behaviors while the gay couples were characterized by similar androgynous behaviors. The BSRI is a self attribution measure that reflects attitudes effectively; it does not measure actual behavior. In summary, the concept of androgyny, along with use of measurements such as the BSRI and a behavioral counterpart, would appear to facilitate research on the gay couple's sex role, attitudes, and behaviors.

Theoretical Framework for Gay Couples

The homosexual couple research, until recently, has not only lacked a theoretical framework and an evaluative instrument to measure sex roles, but also lacked a theoretical

framework with which to examine personality characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors from an interpersonal perspective. Much empirical research has been done on heterosexual couples within the theoretical framework of similarity versus complementarity. The studies done in this area may have some predictive validity regarding relevant variables in homosexual dyads. Two approaches have been postulated to explain the relationship between personality characteristics and attraction in couples. One is the complementary needs hypothesis (Winch, 1954) which states that attraction will occur between the sexes to the extent that the two people possess dissimilar but interdependent personality characteristics. Another approach is the similarity hypothesis which states that if a male and female possess similar attitudes and needs, they will be attracted to each other. The complementary needs hypothesis is supported in the area of personality coordinates (Ktsanes, 1955; Winch, 1955; 1954; Newcomb, 1956; Levinger, 1970). Additional and more specific support was found in the area of nurturance-succorance, and dominance-submission (Winch, 1963; Rychlak, 1965). In contrast, research in the area of personality correlates also provided support for the similarity hypothesis (Izard, 1960; Singh, 1973; Duck, 1973). Additional support for this hypothesis came from research on attitudinal coordinates (Byrne, 1970; 1961; Newcomb, 1965; Duck, 1973). Some studies found support for both hypotheses, but related to different bases for examination (Murstein, 1961; Arnold, 1974; Lindner, 1973;

Kerckhoff, 1962). The literature contains still other studies (Bowerman, 1956; Mehlman, 1962; Markey, 1973; Curran, 1973), which find no evidence for either the similarity or complementarity hypothesis.

Seyfried (1973) used the above theoretical framework in studying the relationship between sex roles and attraction in heterosexual male pairs, female pairs, and male-female couples. Males were attracted to other males with sex roles similar to their own; females were attracted to other females with sex roles similar to their own. In addition, females were attracted to males with complementary sex roles. Neither the complementary nor the similarity theory was supported by the finding that males rated their attraction to females on the basis of the female's sex roles. In similar studies, Hogan (1970) and Byrne (1970) found male and female subjects were attracted towards dominant, manly subjects, regardless of whether the relationship was a complementary or similar one.

In summary, much empirical work has been done using the similarity-complementarity framework, but no clear cut conclusions can be drawn. Part of the problem may be due to the different populations used, as well as the different aspects of behavior which were measured. To postulate a theory which predicts that all needs in mate selection will be in a uniform direction is overly simplistic and homogeneous in outlook as it relates to the heterosexual couple. Bowerman and Day (1956) suggest that similarity may be operative in some

areas, and complementarity in others. Levinger (1970) acknowledged the importance of the research done within this perspective, but suggested that behaviors also be studied. These two studies conclude that the similarity-complementarity framework would be maximally useful in a situation where specific behaviors are examined.

Summarizing the literature up to this point, a multidimensional approach in which personality, attitudes, and behaviors are measured appears appropriate in the study of the homosexual couple. A multidimensional approach was used in a study by Desdin (1977) in which personality, sex role ascription, attitudes toward both men and women's roles, and household behaviors were measured. He found nonclinical gay couples to be similar to nonclinical intimate unmarried heterosexual couples. There were two exceptions to this finding: The attribution of sex roles for gay couples was similar to that of heterosexual male roommates, and their household behaviors were characterized by similarity (both tended to engage in the same activities). In contrast, the sex role attribution of heterosexual couples was different and their household behaviors were characterized by complementarity (household work was performed along traditional lines).

One interesting finding of this study was that the older the gay male, the more conservative were his attitudes toward roles for men. As all couples were under 35 years of age, it is not known to what extent older gay couples might be

characterized by more conservative attitudes toward men or women, or the extent to which these attitudes are reflected in actual sex role behaviors. This potentially significant age factor has not been examined in any previous study. Such a study would provide information on the differences between younger and older stable male gay couples. A study of older and younger couples would not only yield more information about a relatively unresearched relationship, but would also evaluate the effect of age versus change in the homosexual culture. In addition, it would also provide information on generational effects within nontraditional unions.

CHAPTER III

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There have been various criticisms of research and methodology in the study of homosexual individuals. One is the use of clinical patients as subjects. Weinberg and Williams (1974) state that the medical model of homosexuality has been perpetuated by the use of clinical patients as subjects. They suggest a nonclinical group be studied; this study will do so. A second criticism is that a matched control group has rarely been used in this research. Matching on significant variables will be attempted in this study. A third criticism is that previous research views homosexuals as a single unidimensional group. Stringer and Grygier (1976) criticize the simplistic homogeneous view of homosexuality and state that future research should employ a highly differentiated multidimensional approach, a perspective also shared by MacDonald (1974). In addition, Desdin (1977) suggests behaviors as well as attitudes should be studied. The present study will look at various attitudinal measures as well as behavioral measures.

Many of the above criticisms can be applied to the study of the homosexual couple as well. One major criticism of the research on gay couples that must additionally be

considered is that ethnographic observations have not been supplemented with empirical data. More empirical data, gathered using more contemporary instruments, would give a more comprehensive picture of the homosexual couple.

The literature on heterosexual couples is of relevance here in indicating the theoretical framework and the variables that should be studied. This literature has centered on similarity and complementarity as related to attitudes and sex roles. Two studies (out of a total of three) have used this perspective in studying gay couples. Westmoreland (1975) found complementarity in roles to be a good predictor of permanence in the relationship. In contrast, Desdin (1977) found similarity in household behaviors to be characteristic of stable male gay couples. One factor which may explain these results is age. Since different age groups were not employed in either of these studies, it is possible that older gay couples are characterized by complementarity in roles, while younger gay couples are characterized by similarity. As such, the similarity-complementarity framework will be utilized given the limitations previously cited related to generalization and oversimplification.

The present study investigated age effects in the relationships of nonclinical homosexual couples. Given the constraints of subject availability, two age groups (over 35 years of age and under 35 years of age) were matched as closely as possible on income, duration of relationship, and ethnicity. All pairs had lived together for at least six

months. The following variables were studied: sex role ascription-BSRI (Bem, 1974), sex role behaviors-BSRI-BHVR (Green & Desdin, 1977), attitudes toward women-AWS (Spence et al., 1973), attitudes toward men-ATMTS (Moreland & Van Tuinen, 1976), and household behaviors-HBS (Green & Desdin, 1978). The following hypotheses were tested:

1. Individuals in the older gay couples group will be more sex role stereotyped with regard to sex role ascription than the younger gay couples group, as measured by the BSRI.
2. Individuals in the older gay couples group will be more sex role stereotyped with regard to sex role behaviors than the younger gay couples group, as measured by the BSRI-BHVR.
3. Individuals in the older gay couples group will be characterized by more conservative attitudes toward women's roles than the younger gay couples group, as measured by the AWS.
4. Individuals in the older gay couples group will be characterized by more conservative attitudes toward men's roles than the younger gay couples group, as measured by the ATMTS.
5. Individuals in the older gay couples group will be more sex role stereotyped in sex role household behaviors than the younger gay couples group, as measured by the HBS.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Subjects

For this study, a tripartite definition of homosexuality was employed. All homosexual subjects had to agree to the following:

1. I am a homosexual.
2. I am committed to this present relationship.
3. I have homosexual sex with my partner.

The subjects consisted of 15 homosexual couples where both partners were over 35 years of age, and 15 homosexual couples where both partners were under 35 years of age. All subjects had lived together for at least six months and were recruited by friendship pyramiding through Metropolitan Community Churches (MCC) (a nationwide church with homosexual membership) and gay bars in Los Angeles, California. Difficulties were encountered in subject recruitment due to the lack of trust in research and researchers. Individuals had had previous unpleasant experiences. In order to build trust, free lectures and workshops were offered to the gay community. Topics included past research in homosexuality and assertiveness training. At the time of such presentations, subject recruitment was completed. This

approach was found to greatly facilitate this process. In addition to recruiting gay subjects per se, the requirement of obtaining couples who had been together for six months or longer imposed an additional recruitment hardship. The older couples were most difficult to recruit, as they were not as visible, if as prevalent, as the younger couples. It should also be noted that the trust issue discussed above was a more problematic one for these older couples.

Measures

Demographic data relating to age, income, duration of relationship, and level of education was obtained for all subjects. Additionally, the following instruments were utilized.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)

The BSRI is a scale used for measuring sex role ascription, and reflects the degree to which a person defines him/herself as stereotypically "masculine" and "feminine". The scale is constructed so that the masculine and feminine subscales are orthogonally independent of each other; thus, a person can score high on masculine items and/or feminine items.

BEM (1974) developed this 60-item scale from an original pool of 400 items. The author and colleagues judged one-half of these items to be positive in value and either masculine or feminine in tone; the second half were judged

to be "neutral" in tone. On these "neutral" characteristics, half were positive, half were negative. Forty (40) Stanford undergraduates were asked to rate each item on a seven-point scale, ranging from 1 ("Not at all desirable") to 7 ("Extremely desirable"), either "for a man" or "for a woman". A characteristic qualified as masculine or feminine if both males and females independently judged it to be more desirable for the respective sex (based on two-tailed *t*-tests). Twenty masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral items comprised the final list. Test-retest reliability was significant for each scale: Femininity, $r(26) = 0.90$, $p = .005$; Masculinity, $r(26) = 0.90$, $p = .005$; Androgyny, $r(26) = 0.93$, $p = .005$. Validity was measured by correlating scores from the BSRI with the Guilford-Zimmerman and the California Psychological Inventory. These correlations are reported in Bem (1974); she concludes that the BSRI measures an aspect of sex roles not tapped by either of the two other scales. Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the BSRI.

Bem Sex Role Inventory - Behavior Scale

(BSRI-BHVR)

The BSRI-BHVR (Green & Desdin, 1978) is an extension of the BSRI (Bem, 1974). The BSRI-BHVR is an instrument that measures the extent to which the individual engages in specific sex role stereotyped behaviors as indicated by Anglo society. Development of this scale proceeded in the following fashion. Subjects were 10 homosexual men, 10

lesbians, 10 heterosexual men, and 10 heterosexual women. Subjects were recruited through friendship pyramiding (subjects refer to potential subjects) in a college population residing in a south midwestern area of the United States. The authors generated 31 behaviors that represented BSRI adjectives that might be considered more characteristic of male or females. A behavior was to be rated on a five-point Likert-like scale (masculine, somewhat masculine, androgynous, somewhat feminine, feminine). Subjects were asked to rate each behavior as they saw them. The behavior was originally to have been included in the scale if all four groups agreed that the behavior was sex role stereotyped (not androgynous) and also agreed upon the direction of the stereotype (masculine or feminine). However, due to lack of congruence among the raters (the lesbian sample tended to rate all behaviors as androgynous), the lesbian sample had to be deleted so as to ensure a minimum of 10 behaviors. The items were selected in the above fashion utilizing the remaining three groups. The subject's scores were obtained by summing the values of the feminine items, then the scales are respectively averaged. Scores may range from 5 to 25 for each subscale; the higher the score, the more participation in a given masculine or feminine behavior. Test-retest reliability over a six-week interval with graduate and advanced undergraduate students enrolled in psychology classes was .88 for masculine items, .66 for feminine items, and .80 overall (Green & Desdin, 1978). Refer to Appendix B

for a copy of the BSRI-BHVR.

Attitudes Toward Women Scale

The 25-item short form of the Spence and Helmreich (1978) Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) was utilized. The AWS consists of 25 declarative statements for which there are four response alternatives: Agree Strongly, Agree Mildly, Disagree Mildly, and Disagree Strongly. Each item is given a score ranging from 0 to 3, with 0 reflecting the most traditional, conservative attitude and 3 reflecting the most liberal, profeminist attitude. The subject's score is obtained by summing the values for the individual items. Scores may range from 0 to 75; with higher scores reflecting more liberal attitudes and lower scores reflecting more conservative attitudes. A comparison of data collected from University of Texas psychology students during two different semesters (Fall, 1971 and Spring, 1972) indicates that the long form AWS is a reliable instrument (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Correlations between the full form AWS and the 25-item version were .97 for both male and female University of Texas Introductory Psychology students (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Refer to Appendix C for a copy of the HBS.

The Attitude Toward Masculinity

Transcendence Scale (ATMTS)

The ATMTS (Moreland & Van Tuinen, 1976) was developed by presenting 160 Likert-type items to 287 male and 303

female college undergraduates. These items represented a cross section of statements dealing with men as they relate to different types of relationships: women, children, work, achievement, status. The responses to the initial item pool were submitted to item analysis and subsequently factor analyzed. Moreland and Van Tuinen selected a four factor oblique rotation after considering numerous factor solutions. These four factors were used as a guide in selecting items for the scale. These four factors are dominance transcendence, which measures an individual's attitudes toward responsibilities traditionally associated with the head of the household; homophobia transcendence, which measures an individual's attitudes toward expressing affection to members of the same sex; nontraditional roles, which measures an individual's attitudes toward nontraditional concepts of interaction between men and women. These four factors comprise the 54-item scale consisting of declarative statements for which there are five response alternatives: strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, strongly disagree. Subject's scores are obtained by summing up the values (from 0 to 4) of the individual items. Scores range from 0 to 216, with the higher score representing the most liberal attitudes towards men's roles. Scores are obtained for each individual factor, which are then summed up to comprise a total score. Reliabilities are not reported. Validity studies are reportedly ongoing. Refer to Appendix D for a copy of the scale.

The Household Behavior Scale (HBS)

The HBS, developed by Green and Desdin (1977), is a 10-item instrument that measures how actively the individual engages in specific household chores. The chores (items) are categorized as role stereotyped masculine or role stereotyped feminine as indicated by Anglo society. Responses to each item are to be chosen from a five-point Likert-type scale with two end points (e.g., Never-Always). Refer to Green and Desdin (1977) for a description of the development of this scale. Each item is given a score ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 reflecting never participating in a given behavior, and 5 reflecting always participating in a given behavior. The subject's scores are obtained by summing the values of the masculine items and summing the values of the feminine items. Scores may range from 5 to 25 for each subscale; the higher the score, the more participation in a given masculine or feminine behavior. Test-retest reliability over a six week interval with graduate and advanced undergraduate students enrolled in psychology classes was .88 for masculine items, .91 for feminine items, and .92 overall (Green & Desdin, 1977). Refer to Appendix E for a copy of the HBS.

In addition, the Mini-Mult (Kincannon, 1968) was employed as a screening device to ensure that the couples used for data collection were not maladjusted. The Mini-Mult is a 71-item scale which taps the 11 standard validity and clinical MMPI scales.

Procedure

MCC representatives were contacted in the Los Angeles area and informed as to the nature of the research. The present author agreed to deliver an informal lecture on past research on homosexuality in exchange for the opportunity to recruit subjects. To ensure as representative a sample as possible, subjects were also recruited through gay bars and local gay organizations (e.g., Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center). After agreeing to serve as subjects, the couples were contacted by phone at which time the researcher introduced himself and gave the couple the option of either being tested at a mutually agreed upon location or at the church or organization. Instructions were given and the tests were administered in the order given above. Refer to Appendix F for a copy of the instructions. No names were placed on the data, tests were coded by number, thus, subjects were guaranteed anonymity. Subjects were debriefed and informed that if they desired, their specific results would be interpreted at a later date.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The dependent variables were as follows:

Demographic--

1. Age (AGE)
2. Income (INC)
3. Time together (TIM)
4. Education (EDI)

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)--

5. BSRI masculinity score (BSRM)
6. BSRI femininity score (BSRF)
7. BSRI androgyny score (BSBA)

Bem Sex Role Inventory - Behaviors Scale (BSBS)--

8. BSBS masculinity score (BSBM)
9. BSBS femininity score (BSBF)
10. BSBS androgyny score (BSBA)

Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS)--

11. AWS score

Attitudes Towards Masculine Transcendence Scale (ATMTS)--

12. ATMTS total Score (ATMT)
13. ATMTS dominance transcendence score (ATDT)
14. ATMTS homophobia transcendence score (ATHT)
15. ATMTS nontraditional roles score (ANTR)

16. ATMTS male-female relationships score (AMFR)
Household Behaviors Scale (HBS)--

17. MHS masculinity score (HBSM)
 18. HBS femininity score (HBSF)
 19. HBS androgyny score (HBSA)

Means and standard deviations for all dependent measures separately for the two groups are reported in Table I (see Appendix A).

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were utilized to assess relationships among the dependent variables. The results of the correlational analysis are found in Table II (see Appendix A). Of particular interest were the following significant correlations: (1) AWS and AGE $r = -0.30$; the older the homosexual male, the lower was his AWS score; the more conservative were his attitudes toward women, (2) ATMTS and AGE; ATMT, $r = -0.45$, ATDT, $r = -0.41$, ATHT, $r = -0.27$, ANTR, $r = -0.23$, AMFR, $r = -0.44$; the older the homosexual male the more conservative were his attitudes toward men. These results support the hypotheses which predicted that the older the homosexual male, the more conservative his attitudes would be toward both men and women. Other interesting significant results included the positive correlations between the BSRI variables and the BSRB variables (BSRM and BSBM $(+.39)$; BSRF and BSBF $(+.42)$; BSRA and BSBA $(+.62)$). The masculinity scores of both scales were significantly correlated, as were the femininity and androgyny scores, respectively.

An overall multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed on all the dependent measures except age. Significant differences were found ($F = 3.12$, $df = 18/41$, $p = .001$) between the two groups by the Wilks' Criterion.

One way ANOVAs were utilized to assess differences among the two groups of subjects on the demographic variables. Refer to Table III (see Appendix A) for a summary of these analyses. Significant differences were found between the two groups for the variables of age, income, and time together. Group II was older than Group I; Group II had a higher income than Group I; Group II had been together longer than Group I. No significance was reported for the variable of level of education.

Hypothesis 1 looked at differences in sex role ascription, reflected by scores on the BSRI. An overall multivariate analysis of variance was computed on the BSRI variables resulting in no significant differences ($F = .672$, $df = 3/56$, $p = .573$) between the two groups by the Wilks' Criterion. No differences were found between the two groups on masculine sex role ascription (BSRM), feminine sex role ascription, (BSRF), or androgyny sex role ascription (BSRA). The above results do not support the hypothesis that the older gay couples would be more sex role stereotyped with regard to sex role ascription than the younger couples.

Hypothesis 2 looked at differences in sex role behaviors as measured by the BSRI-BHVR. An overall multivariate analysis of variance was computed on the BSRI-BHVR

measures resulting in no significant differences ($F = 2.25$, $df = 3/56$, $p = .092$) using the Wilks' Criterion. No differences were found between the two groups on the masculinity score (BSBM), femininity score (BSBF), or androgyny score (BSBA). The above results do not support the hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples would be more sex role stereotyped with regard to behaviors than the individuals in the younger gay couples, as measured by the BSRI-BHVR.

Hypothesis 3 looked at differences in attitudes toward women's roles as reflected by the AWS. The analysis of variance performed on the AWS variable resulted in significance. Refer to Table IV (see Appendix A) for a summary of this analysis. Group II scores were significantly lower than Group I. The above result supported the hypothesis that the older gay couples would be characterized by more conservative attitudes toward women's roles than the younger gay couples as reflected by the AWS.

Hypothesis 4 looked at differences in attitudes towards men's roles, as reflected by the ATMTS. An overall multivariate analysis of variance was computed on the ATMTS measures resulting in no significant differences ($F = 1.45$, $df = 5/54$, $p = .220$) using the Wilk's Criterion. No differences were found between the two groups on the total score (ATMT), dominance transcendence score (ATDT), homophobia transcendence score (ATHT), nontraditional role score (ANTR), or male-female relationships score (AMFR). Because

the two groups differed significantly on the demographic variable, time spent together (supported by the strong relationship between age and time spent together) coupled with the significant correlations found between the ATMTS variables an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed on the ATMTS total score. Refer to Table V (see Appendix A) for a summary of this analysis. Results indicated both age ($F = 4.28$, $p < .05$) and length of relationships ($F = 4.18$, $p < .05$) to be significant. That is, the older the individual in the gay couple, the more conservative were his attitudes towards men's roles and the longer the relationship, the more conservative were their attitudes as well.

Hypothesis 5 looked at differences in sex role behaviors, as measured by the HBS. An overall multivariate analysis of variance was computed on the HBS measures resulting in no significant differences ($F = .608$, $df = 3/56$, $p = .612$) using the Wilks' Criterion. No significant differences were found between the two groups on the masculine score (HBMS), feminine score (HBSF), or androgyny score (HBSA). The above results do not support the hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples would be more sex role stereotyped in the sex role household behaviors than the individuals in the younger gay couples, as measured by the HBS.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples group would be more sex role stereotyped with regard to sex role ascription than the younger gay couples was not supported. No significant differences were found between the two groups on any of the BSRI variables. Basically both groups were non-sex role stereotyped. This result is in agreement with previous ethnographic research (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Mendola, 1980; Silverstein, 1981), and extends the Desdin (1977) finding of non-sex role typed ascription to include homosexual male couples over 35 years of age. In other words, equality in sex role ascription was found to be characteristic of both younger and older couples, with the sex role ascription in the masculine direction.

This study was in part generated by concern that findings in the Desdin (1977) study were biased because all subjects were under 35 years of age. The current finding would appear to invalidate this concern. In addition, the current findings provide support for the alternative explanation adhered to by Hooker (1969), that the pattern of egalitarian sex roles is attributable to the changing culture of

the homosexual world. The above hypothesis was an extension from the Desdin (1977) finding that the older the homosexual male, the more conservative were his attitudes toward both men's and women's roles. Apparently these more conservative attitudes were not reflected in the homosexual males sex role ascriptions.

The hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples group would exhibit more stereotyped BSRI-BHVR sex role behaviors than individuals in the younger gay couples group was not supported. It appears that there is not an intergenerational behavioral gap as relates to these couples studied. Both these groups exhibited nonstereotyped behaviors. Again, this finding supports the ethnographic research finding egalitarian sex roles. These couples have arrived at similar behavioral patterns based on pragmatism rather than majority society's conceptions of male and female roles.

The hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples group would exhibit more stereotyped HBS behaviors than the younger gay couples group was not supported. There may be several reasons for this. One explanation is that the testing instrument is not sensitive enough to pick up these differences. However, in previous studies (Desdin, 1977; Kranan, Green, & Valencia-Weber, 1982) this instrument has appeared to be sensitive and valid. A second explanation is that age is not a variable influencing household behaviors in gay couples. The second explanation appears to

be the most viable, and along with the other sex role measures provides empirical support to the ethnographic studies citing egalitarian behaviors in gay male couples. Thus, the Desdin (1977) findings of androgynous household behaviors in gay male couples under 35 years of age can be extended to include those over 35 years of age as well.

The hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples group would be characterized by more conservative attitudes toward women's roles than the individuals in the younger gay couples group, as measured by the AWS, was supported. This finding is in agreement with the negative correlation found between age and AWS scores found in the Desdin (1977) study, and extends the finding to include gay men over the age of 35. It is likely that this difference is a result of two related factors; the effects of gay liberation and the antecedent women's movement on the younger gay males. Although no significant educational differences (length of education) were found between the inter-generational couples, the type of education they experienced and the world in which they grew up no doubt was different.

The hypothesis that the individuals in the older gay couples would be characterized by more conservative attitudes toward men's roles than the individuals in the younger gay couples group, as measured by the ATMTS, was not supported. Although the ATMTS variables were found to be negatively correlated with age these differences were apparently not large enough to attain significance. However,

in an analysis of covariance conducted to adjust for the variation due to age and time spent together, both of these covariates attain significance. Apparently older gay males adhere to traditional attitudes towards men. This may be due to the social, political, and educational climate in which they grew up. The significance of time spent together is more difficult to interpret due to its relationship with age. Future studies might investigate the effects of length of relationship holding age constant (although subject recruitment for such a study would be very difficult!)

Summarizing the findings, the intergenerational gay couples studied did not differ significantly on sex role ascription or sex role behaviors. However, they did differ significantly in their attitudes towards both men and women's roles, with older gay couples espousing more conservative attitudes.

Why they do not ascribe to traditional sex roles and do not behave in a traditional sex role fashion while at the same time holding conservative attitudes is unclear. One possible explanation is that the older gay couples grew up in a different time. The norm for gays was to be "in the closet" to avoid legal, social, and occupational persecution. In order to accomplish this, a person had to learn to espouse traditional views so as to function in society. This "survival" tactic may not have been as necessary for the younger gay couples who grew up in a time in which there was much vocal dissent and espousing of

non-traditional views. In this more liberal environment, it was much easier to find support for one's non-traditional sexual orientation and subsequent views. In summary, the similarity found in younger gay couples between attitudes and behaviors and the complementarity found in older gay couples, may be due to the different social environments in which they grew up.

These conclusions should be seen as tentative for two reasons. First of all, a possible problem with the study is that the sample size utilized was relatively small and limited to a particular geographic location. Thus, it would be difficult to generalize these findings to a different section of the country. However, it is important to note the similarities between these present findings and those of the Desdin (1977) study completed in a different geographic region. In both studies, the gay couples were characterized by sharing in household behaviors and both members of the pair had sex role ascriptions tending toward a masculine direction. In addition, the older the gay male, the more conservative were his attitudes toward both men and women's roles. This impressive similarity between findings in Oklahoma and California strengthens the extent to which the present conclusions can be generalized. The author would recommend expanding these findings to other areas of the country and utilizing larger samples to ascertain the validity of the present findings.

A second possible problem with this present research is

the use of various types of couples in the sample. Both "open" and "closed" types of relationships were studied, it is possible that this may be a confounding factor in interpreting the results. Future research should examine the difference between these two types of relationships as related to sex role attitudes, sex role ascription and sex role behaviors. As "open" types of relationships do not appear to be the exception among homosexuals, this is an important area for future research.

REFERENCES

- Altman, D. Homosexual: Oppression and liberation. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1971.
- Altman, D. Introduction. In Len Richmond & Gary Noguera (Eds.), The gay liberation book. San Francisco: Tamparts Press, 1973.
- Arnold, S. M. Compatability and stability in roommate relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 4012B.
- Bell, A., & Weinberg, M. Homosexualities. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.
- Bieber, I. A psychoanalytic study of male homosexuality. New York: Basic Books, 1962.
- Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-528.
- Bowerman, C. E., & Day, B. R. A test of the theory of complementary needs as applied to couples during courtship. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 602-605.
- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., & Clarkson, F. E. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-725.
- Byrne, D., & Palmer, J. Attraction toward dominant and submissive strangers: Similarity vs. complementarity. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1970, 4, 108-115.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Cooper, A. J. Aetiology of homosexuality. In J. A. Loraine (Ed.), Homosexuality: Its biological and psychological bases. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc., 1974.
- Curran, J. P. Examination of various interpersonal attraction principles in the dating dyad. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1973, 6, 347-356.
- Desdin, R. A focus on homosexual couples: An examination of personalities, sex roles, attitudes and behaviors. Unpublished manuscript, 1977.
- Deutsch, C. J., & Gilbert, L. A. Sex role stereotypes: Effect on perceptions of self and others and on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 373-379.
- Dickey, B. A. Attitudes toward sex roles and feelings of adequacy in homosexual males. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 116-122.
- Duck, S. W. Personality similarity and friendship choice: Similarity of what, when? Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 543-558.
- Evans, R. B. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire scores of homosexual men. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 212-215.
- Freeman, M. Homosexuals may be healthier than straights. Psychology Today, March, 1975, 28-32.
- Green, V., & Desdin, R. The household behavior scale. Submitted manuscript, 1977.
- Green, V., & Desdin, R. Bem sex role inventory -behavior. Unpublished manuscript, 1978.

- Hammersmikth, S. K., & Weinberg, M. S. Homosexual identity: Commitment, adjustment, and significant others. Sociometry, 1973, 36, 56-79.
- Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex role research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1011-1029.
- Hogan, R., & Mankin, D. Determinants of interpersonal attraction: A clarification. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 235-238.
- Hooker, E. The adjustment of the male overt homosexual. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1957, 21, 18-31.
- Hooker, E. The homosexual community. In R. W. Weltge (Ed.), The same sex. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.
- Humphreys, L. Tearoom trade. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.
- Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51.
- Jenkin, N., & Vroegh, K. Contemporary concepts of masculinity and femininity. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 679-697.
- Kando, T. M. Role strain: A comparison of males, females, and transsexuals. Journal of Marriage and the Family, August, 1972, 459-464.
- Kerckhoff, A. C., & Davis, K. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders Company, 1984.
- Kranau, E. J., Green, V., & Valencia-Weber, G. Acculturation and the Hispanic woman: Attitudes toward women, sex role attribution, sex role behavior and demographics. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1982, 4, 21-40.
- KtsanesT. Mate selection on the basis of personality type: A study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 547-551.

- Levinger, F., Senn, D. J., & Jorgense, B. W. Progress toward permanence in courtship: A test of the Kerchoff-Davis hypothesis. Sociometry, 1970, 33, 427-443.
- Lindner, B. J. Patterning of psychological type, interpersonal understanding, and marital happiness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 417B.
- Loevinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.
- MacDonald, Jr., A. P. Identification and measurement of multidimensional attitudes toward equality between the sexes. Journal of Homosexuality, 1974, 1, 165-182.
- Markey, V. K. Psychological need relationships in dyadic attraction and rejection. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 111-123.
- May, E. P. Perceptions on homosexuals and nonhomosexuals. The Otherwise Monograph Series, National Task Force on Student Personnel Services and Homosexuality, 1972.
- Mednick, M. T. The psychology of women: Selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26, 1-16.
- Mendola, M. The mendola report. New York: Crown Publishers, 1980.
- Mehlman, B. Similarity in friendships. Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 57, 195-202.
- Miller, N., Campbell, D. T., Twedt, H., & O'Connell, E. J. Similarity, contrast, and complementarity in friendship choice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 3-12.
- Moreland, J., & Van tuinen, M. The attitude toward masculinity transcendence scale. Notes -unpublished manuscript, July 1978, obtainable from Authors.
- Murstein, B. I. The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle-aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 194-197.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.

- Nuehring, E. M., Fein, S. B., & Tyler, M. The gay college student: Perspectives for mental health professionals. Counseling Psychologist, 1974, 4, 64-72.
- Oberstone, A. K., & Sukoneck, H. Psychological adjust and lifestyle of single lesbians and single heterosexual women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1976, 1, 172-188.
- Ohlson, E. L. A preliminary investigation into the self-disclosing ability of male homosexuals. Psychology, 1973, 10, 21-25.
- Orlofsky, J. Relationship between sex role attitudes and personality traits and the sex role behavior scale-I: A new measure of masculine and feminine role behaviors and interests. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 5, 927-940.
- Osofsky, J. D., & Osofsky, J. H. Androgyny as a life style. The Family Coordinator, 1972, 21, 411-418.
- Rychlak, J. R. The similarity, compatability, or incompatibility of needs in interpersonal selection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 334-340.
- Schoffield, M. Sociological aspects of homosexuality. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1965.
- Seyfried, B. A., & Hendrick, C. When do opposites attract? When they are opposite in sex and sex role attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 15-20.
- Siegelman, M. Adjustment of male homosexuals and heterosexual. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1972, 2, 9-25.
- Silverstein, C. Man to man. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1981.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. Homosexuality: The formulation of a sociological perspective. In R. W. Weltge (Ed.), The same sex. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.
- Singh, R. Attraction as a function of similarity in attitudes and personality characteristics. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91, 87-95.

- Socarides, C. W. Homosexuality: Basic concepts and psychodynamics. International Journal of Psychiatry, 1972, 10, 118-125.
- Sonenschein, D. The ethnography of male homosexual relationships. Journal of Sex Research, 1968, 4, 69-83.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 127.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (aws). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Stringer, P., & Grygier, T. Male homosexuality, psychiatric patient status, and psychological masculinity and femininity. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1976, 5, 15-27.
- Sweet, R. T., Political and social action in homophile organizations. New York: New York Times Company, Arno Press, 1975.
- Tavris, C. Masculinity. Psychology Today. January, 1977, 35-42.
- Taylor, R. M. Taylor-Johnson temperament analysis manual. Los Angeles, Psychological Publications, Inc., 1973.
- Terman, L., & Miles, C. C. Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936.
- Thompson, Jr., N. L., McCandless, B. R., & Strickland, B. R. Personal adjustment of male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78, 237-240.
- Tripp, C. A. The homosexual matrix. New York: New American Library, Inc., 1975.
- Ward, S. Cited in Spence et al. (1975).
- Warren, C. A. B. Identity and community in the gay world. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

- Weinberg, G. H. Society and the healthy homosexual. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.
- Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. Male homosexuals: Their problems and adaptations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Winch, R. F. The theory of complementary needs in mate-selections: Final results on the test of the general hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 241-249.
- Winch, R. F. The modern family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Zeldow, P. B. Psychological androgyny and attitudes towards feminism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 150.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE I
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS: ALL VARIABLES

Variable (N = 30 each)	Group I Homosexual Couples Under 35 Years of Age		Group II Homosexual Couples Over 35 Years of Age	
	M	SD	M	SD
AGE	27.7	4.38	45.1	9.0
INC	13,960.0	9,300.0	18,350.0	7,600.0
TIME	2.7	2.6	13.1	9.6
EDU	14.7	2.9	15.1	2.4
BSRM	5.02	.70	4.87	.73
BSRF	4.85	.45	4.74	.64
BSRA	-.19	.74	-.13	.81
BSBM	3.75	.54	3.46	.45
BSBF	3.57	.62	3.52	.37
BSBA	-.13	.61	.07	.48
AWS	61.6	7.10	56.9	10.62
ATMT	156.67	15.85	144.6	19.24
ATDT	35.37	4.17	33.23	4.41
ATHT	58.07	6.84	55.80	8.93
ANTR	31.38	5.53	29.33	4.05
AMFR	31.07	4.85	38.23	6.10
HBSM	3.80	.64	3.69	.63
HBSF	3.69	.65	3.57	.71
HBSA	-.13	.68	-.12	.61

KEY TO VARIABLES

AGE - age of individual subjects	AWS - attitudes towards women score
INC - income of individual subjects	ATMT - total score ATMTS
TIME - duration of relationship in years	ATDT - dominance transcendence score ATMTS
EDU - educational level in years	ATHT - homophobia transcendence score ATMTS
BSRM - masculinity score BSRI	ANTR - nontraditional roles score ATMTS
BSRF - femininity score BSRI	AMFR - male-female relationship score ATMTS
BSRA - androgyny score BSRI	HBSM - masculinity score HBS
BSBM - masculinity score BSRI-BHVR	HBSF - femininity score HBS
BSBF - femininity score BSRI-BHVR	HBSA - androgyny score HBS
BSBA - androgyny score BSRI-BHVR	

TABLE II
CORRELATIONAL MATRIX

	BY GROUP	AGE	INC	TIME	EDU	BSRM	BSRF	BSRA	BSBM	BSBF	BSBA	AWS	ATMT	ATDT	ATHT	ANTR	AMFR	HBSM	HBSF	HBSA
BY GROUP	1.00																			
AGE	.78	1.00																		
INC	.25	.21	1.00																	
TIME	.60	.82**	-.01	1.00																
EDU	.09	.05	.41**	-.16	1.00															
BSRM	-.11	-.17	.29*	-.27*	.13	1.00														
BSRF	-.10	-.18	-.06	-.09	-.25*	.31**	1.00													
BSRA	.03	.02	-.33**	.17	-.30**	-.72**	-.44**	1.00												
BSBM	-.29*	-.24*	.18	-.29*	-.01	.39**	.01	-.35**	1.00											
BSBF	-.04	-.06	.13	.09	-.06	.05	.42**	.28*	.45**	1.00										
BSBA	.18	.13	-.08	.16	-.06	-.34**	.40**	.62**	-.52**	.49**	1.00									
AWS	-.26*	-.30**	.20	-.36**	.10	.37**	.38**	-.07	.20	.38**	.13	1.00								
ATMT	-.33**	-.45**	-.04	-.32**	.01	.29*	.39**	.01	.19	.35**	.12	.78**	1.00							
ATDT	-.26*	-.41**	-.17	-.32**	.01	.21	.35**	.07	.12	.35**	.20	.67**	.86**	1.00						
ATHT	-.24*	-.27*	-.07	-.26*	-.04	-.02	.09	.10	.12	.23*	.11	.61**	.72**	.52**	1.00					
ANTR	-.25*	-.23*	.03	-.05	.00	.39**	.35**	-.12	.08	.12	-.01	.46**	.69**	.43**	.31**	1.00				
AMFR	-.24*	-.44**	.15	-.35**	.12	.27*	.33**	-.02	.21	.30*	.08	.66**	.83**	.63**	.51**	.46**	1.00			
HBSM	-.09	.04	.16	-.10	.02	.22*	.01	-.18	.27*	.16	-.08	.23*	.00	-.02	-.01M	.00	-.01	1.00		
HBSF	-.09	.04	.02	-.06	-.15	-.04	.19	.23*	.05	.29*	.22	.28*	-.01	-.02	.07F	-.05	-.08	.52**	1.00	
HBSA	.00	.01	-.13	.05	-.16	-.31**	.18	.42**	-.21	.15	.30**	.68	-.01	.00	.08A	-.04	.07	-.42**	.55**	1.00

*p<.05

**p>.01

KEY TO VARIABLES

AGE - age of individual subjects

INC - income of individual subjects

TIME - duration of relationship in years

EDU - educational level in years

BSRM - masculinity score BSR1

BSRF - femininity score BSR1

BSRA - androgyny score BSR1

BSBM - masculinity score BSRI-BHVR

BSBF - femininity score BSRI-BHVR

BSBA - androgyny score BSRI-BHVR

AWS - attitudes towards women score

ATMT - total score ATMTS

ATDT - dominance transcendence score ATMTS

ATHT - homophobia transcendence score ATMTS

ANTR - nontraditional roles score ATMTS

AMFR - male-female relationship score ATMTS

HBSM - masculinity score HBS

HBSF - femininity score HBS

HBSA - androgyny score HBS

TABLE III
ANALYSES OF VARIANCE: DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
<u>Age</u>				
Group	4,506.66	1	4,506.66	90.01***
Residual	2,903.66	58	50.06	
<u>Income</u>				
Group	289.08	1	289.08	4.03*
Residual	4,160.55	58	71.734	
<u>Time Together</u>				
Group	1,605.80	1	1,605.80	32.31***
Residual	2,881.85	58		
<u>Grade</u>				
Group	3.267	1	3.267	.467
Residual	406.12	58	7.002	

* $p < .05$

*** $p < .001$

TABLE IV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: ATTITUDES TOWARDS WOMEN SCALE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Group	331.350	1	331.350	4.06*
Residual of relationship	4,733.863	58	81.618	

* $p < .05$

TABLE V
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE: ATMTS TOTAL SCORE

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Main Effect: Age	331.35	1	331.35	4.28*
Covariate: Length of relationship	323.54	1	323.54	4.18*
Residual	4410.33	57	77.37	4.23*

* $p < .05$

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS

The tests you will be taking will be measuring different aspects of your relationship. Since there are no right or wrong answers, please answer as honestly as you can. It is important that you do not discuss the test material while you are taking it. You may proceed now if there are no questions. Let me know when you are done.

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTS

DEMOGRAPHICS

AGE: _____

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN TOGETHER? _____

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED: _____

BEM SEX ROLE INVENTORY
DESCRIBE YOURSELF

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Never or Usually Sometimes but Occasionally Often Usually Always or
 almost never not infrequently true true true almost always
 true true true true true true

Self reliant	Reliable	Warm
Yielding	Analytical	Solemn
Helpful	Sympathetic	Willing to take a stand
Defends own beliefs	Jealous	Tender
Cheerful	has leadership abilities	Friendly
Moody	Sensitive to the needs of others	Aggressive
Independent	Truthful	Gullible
Shy	Willing to take risks	Inefficient
Conscientious	Understanding	Acts as a leader
Athletic	Secretive	Childlike
Affectionate	Makes decisions easily	Adaptable
Theatrical	Compassionate	Individualistic
Assertive	Sincere	Does not use harsh language
Flatterable	Self-sufficient	Unsystematic
Happy	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	Competitive
Strong personality	Conceited	Loves children
Loyal	Dominant	Tactful
Unpredictable	Soft-spoken	Ambitious
Forceful	Likeable	Gently
Feminine	Masculine	Conventional

BEM SEX ROLE INVENTORY - BEHAVIORS

Please indicate the degree to which you participate in the following behaviors by placing the appropriate number by the corresponding statements.

never rarely sometimes often always
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

- ___ 1. If you have hurt someone, wanting to make him/her feel good as quickly as possible.
- ___ 2. Hugging someone.
- ___ 3. Hardly ever raising your voice.
- ___ 4. Fixing things without anyone's help.
- ___ 5. Initiating sex.
- ___ 6. Being publicly opinionated.
- ___ 7. Knowing what to do in an emergency.
- ___ 8. Saying "I'm sorry" after you've hurt someone.
- ___ 9. Striving for a high goal.
- ___ 10. Saying "you are full of it".
- ___ 11. Being in a heartwarming situation.
- ___ 12. Stopping to play with an infant or child.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS WOMEN SCALE

You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly. Please indicate your answer by placing the appropriate letter by the statement number.

(A) agree strongly

(C) disagree mildly

(B) agree mildly

(D) disagree strongly

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.
2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
6. Under modern economic conditions with woman being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
7. It is insulting to women to have to "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS MASCULINE TRANSCENDENCE SCALE

Strongly Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly
 0-----1-----2-----3-----4

1. In a male-female relationship the man should make most of the important decisions.
2. Men tend to over-emphasize winning in sports and games.
3. I think men ought to feel free to have sex with each other.
4. I think it's wrong for men to be sexually attracted to each other.
5. Men should be encouraged to do volunteer work in their children's classrooms.
6. Men should be discouraged from going into occupations typically held only by women.
7. The women's liberation movement will benefit men.
8. In general, a man should be more assertive than a female companion.
9. A man's major role with children is to teach them to be strong.
10. A man should assume the leadership position when working on any project with a female colleague.
11. A man owes it to his family to financially support them to the best of his ability.
12. A man should be physically stronger than his female companion.
13. Men should have less responsibility for child rearing than women.
14. Male children should be discouraged from developing interests in traditionally feminine pursuits like sewing, an appreciation of flowers, dishware, etc.
15. A man can't respect a sexually assertive woman.
16. It's a man's prerogative to propose marriage.

(A) agree strongly
(B) agree mildly

(C) disagree mildly
(D) disagree strongly

11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up the children.
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés.
18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and housetending rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS MASCULINE TRANSCENDENCE SCALE

Strongly Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly
 0-----1-----2-----3-----4

17. A good husband should solve his spouse's problems for her.
18. I believe it's alright for a man to make less money than his wife.
19. Men should not feel protective toward women.
20. A husband should feel free to stay home and do housework, childcare, etc., and have his wife support him.
21. Men need to learn to be more emotional.
22. Men are as aware of their own feelings as they need to be.
23. I think women should feel free to pick up men.
24. I think it's alright for a woman to be sexually assertive.
25. It's alright for a man to be less intelligent than his wife.
26. A man and a woman should have equal responsibility for making a date successful.
27. It's wrong for a man not to work for a living.
28. A man should open doors, light cigarettes, etc., for a woman.
29. Generally speaking, men tend to be too interested in sports, science, money, business, and objects, and not interested enough in people, the arts, and nature.
30. Men should be tender in sex.
31. Generally, a married man should be free to develop close friendships with other women.
32. Men should have more sexual freedom than women.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS MASCULINE TRANSCENDENCE SCALE

Strongly Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly
 0-----1-----2-----3-----4

33. A man should feel free to discuss his personal problems with a friend.
34. I feel that work is a man's most important function.
35. I think it's a good idea for men to be able to touch and hug each other.
36. Men ought to be given time off (like a year) to take care of their children.
37. Men should encourage their employers to establish day care facilities in their place of work.
38. Men tend to be too logical and rational.
39. A man should be hired instead of a woman if he has a family to support.
40. A man should leave a party if his female partner is ready to go home, even if he is having a good time.
41. A successful sex life in marriage depends mostly on the man.
42. A man should be respected more if he is seen with attractive women.
43. Men ought to be handy doing things around the house, i.e., cooking, cleaning, decorating, etc.
44. I think it is unmanly for a man to talk about close personal problems with another man.
45. It is difficult to respect a man who prefers activities like sewing, cooking, and child care.
46. A husband and wife should be able to take separate vacations.
47. In an ongoing relationship, the frequency of sexual relations is a direct reflection on the male's masculinity.

ATTITUDES TOWARDS MASCUINE TRANSCENDENCE SCALE

Strongly Agree Uncertain Disagree Strongly
 0-----1-----2-----3-----4

48. Child raising should be as important to a man as his job.
49. I don't think a male can call himself a man unless he has had sex with a woman.
50. I think it's unnecessary for a man to feel inferior to someone just because that person has a better job.
51. It is important for a man to settle his family in one of the best neighborhoods.
52. A man must not let other things interfere with his success at work.
53. A man and a woman should have equal input into any decision which affects them both.
54. Only a lazy man would enjoy working less than full-time.

HOUSEHOLD BEHAVIORS SCALE

Please indicate the degree to which you participate in the following behaviors by placing the appropriate number by the corresponding statements.

never rarely sometimes often always
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

- ___ 1. Taking out the gargage.
- ___ 2. Washing the dishes.
- ___ 3. Paying the bills
- ___ 4. Driving the car.
- ___ 5. Cleaning the house.
- ___ 6. Fixing things around the house.
- ___ 7. Taking care of the car.
- ___ 8. Doing the laundry.
- ___ 9. Doing the cooking.
- ___ 10. Buying the groceries.

MINI-MULTT

Please circle the following itmes, marked TRUE of FALSE, as they apply to you most of the time. Please answer all of the questions.

- T F 1. I have a good appetite.
- T F 2. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
- T F 3. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
- T F 4. I work under a great deal of tension.
- T F 5. Once in awhile, I think of things too bad to talk about.
- T F 6. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.
- T F 7. At times, I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
- T F 8. At times, I have very much wanted to leave home.
- T F 9. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
- T F 10. No one seems to understand me.
- T F 11. At times I feel like swaring.
- T F 12. I have nightmares every few nights.
- T F 13. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or a job.
- T F 14. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
- T F 15. If people had not had it in for me, I would have been much more successful.
- T F 16. During one period when I was a youngster, I engaged in petty thievery.
- T F 17. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going".
- T F 18. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.

(A) agree strongly
(B) agree mildly

(C) disagree mildly
(D) disagree strongly

- T F 19. When I am with people I am bothered by hearing very queer things.
- T F 20. I am liked by most people who know me.
- T F 21. I have often had to take orders from someone who did not know as much as I did.
- T F 22. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
- T F 23. I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes to gain the sympathy and help of others.
- T F 24. I get angry sometimes.
- T F 25. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
- T F 26. I have little or no trouble with my muscles twitching or jumping.
- T F 27. Much of the time, I feel as if I have done something wrong or evil.
- T F 28. I am happy most of the time.
- T F 29. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.
- T F 30. I believe I am being plotted against.
- T F 31. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
- T F 32. I have a great deal of stomach trouble.
- T F 33. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
- T F 34. At times, my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.
- T F 35. I believe that my home life is as pleasant as that of most people I know.
- T F 36. I certainly feel useless at times.
- T F 37. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.

(A) agree strongly
(B) agree mildly

(C) disagree mildly
(D) disagree strongly

- T F 38. I have had periods in which I carried on activities without knowing later what I had been doing.
- T F 39. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.
- T F 40. I have never felt better in my life than I do now.
- T F 41. What others think of me does not bother me.
- T F 42. My memory seems to be all right.
- T F 43. I find it hard to talk when I meet new people.
- T F 44. I feel weak all over much of the time.
- T F 45. I have very few headaches.
- T F 46. I have had no difficulty in keeping my balance in walking.
- T F 47. I do not like everyone I know.
- T F 48. There are people who are trying to steal my thoughts and ideas.
- T F 49. I wish I were not so shy.
- T F 50. I believe my sins are unpardonable.
- T F 51. I frequently find myself worrying about something.
- T F 52. My parents have often objected to the kind of people I went around with.
- T F 53. I gossip a little at times.
- T F 54. At times I feel that I can make up my mind with great ease.
- T F 55. I hardly ever notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath.
- T F 56. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.

(A) agree strongly
(B) agree mildly

(C) disagree mildly
(D) disagree strongly

- T F 57. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
- T F 58. My parents and family find more fault with me than they should.
- T F 59. No one much cares what happens to me.
- T F 60. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
- T F 61. At times I am all full of energy.
- T F 62. My eyesight is as good as it has been for years.
- T F 63. I do not often notice my ears reinging or buzzing.
- T F 64. At one or more times in my life I felt that someone was making me do things by hypnotizing me.
- T F 65. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful.
- T F 66. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
- T F 67. I think nearly everyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
- T F 68. I am more sensitive than most other people.
- T F 69. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
- T F 70. People often disappoint me.
- T F 71. I have used alcohol excessively.

2
VITA

Roberto Desdin

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: INTERGENERATIONAL MALE HOMOSEXUAL COUPLES: AN
EXAMINATION OF SEX ROLE ASCRIPTION, ATTITUDES
TOWARD MEN'S AND WOMEN'S ROLES AND SEX ROLE
BEHAVIORS

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Banes, Cuba, November 19, 1952,
the son of Saturnino and Pilar Desdin. Fluent in
Spanish, French and English.

Education: Graduated from Memorial High School, West
New York, New Jersey, in 1970, with Memorial
Scholars Award; received Bachelor of Arts degree,
cum laude, with specialized honors in Psychology
from Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, in
1974; received the Master of Science degree at
Oklahoma State University, December 1977; com-
pleted requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at Oklahoma State University in
December 1983.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Depart-
ment of Psychology, Oklahoma State University,
Fall 1974, Spring 1975, Fall 1976, Fall 1977;
Research Assistant, Department of Psychology,
Oklahoma State University, Spring 1975, Fall 1975;
Psychological Associate, Payne County Guidance
Center, 1974-1975; Psychological Associate, Bi-
State Mental Health Agency, 1975-1976; Psycho-
logical Associate, Psychological Services Center,
1976-1978. LAC/USC Medical Center Clinical Psy-
chology Internship, 1978-79, El Centro Community
Mental Health Services, 1979; Director of Adult
and Elderly Day Treatment Services.